

MEETING MINUTES

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)
DATE: JULY 13, 2004
TIME: 8:30 A.M. TO 12:00 A.M.
LOCATION: 6F

WEAT Members:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect— Patricia Carlson (DET)
- Enterprise Architect—Bud Borja (Milwaukee County, local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect—Mickey Crittenden (Rock County, local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect—Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Enterprise Architect—Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect—Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect—Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)

DET Governance Staff:

- Michelle Eldridge and Molly Conroy

DET Operations and Development Staff:

- Phil Schwarz

Note: Bud Borja attended the meeting via teleconference call.

Agenda Items

1. Enterprise Updates —Patricia Carlson
 - 1.1. DET WEAT Staffing Changes
 - 1.2. Email Consolidation
 - 1.3. Server Consolidation
 - 1.4. AIM-IT
 - 1.5. BLC Update
2. Discussion regarding revised EA Deliverables and Work Products – Patricia Carlson
 - 2.1 Short term tactical EA Deliverables and Work Products

- 2.2 Long term strategic EA Deliverables and Work Products
- 2.3. Define Next Steps
- 2.4. Assign Deliverables, Tasks for 7-27 WEAT Meeting

3. Discussion of Comments to EA Strategy and EA Business Plan Draft Document —Patricia Carlson (20 minutes)

- 3.1. Agency Comments
- 3.2. Vendor Comments
- 3.3. Define Next Steps
- 3.4. Assign Deliverables, Tasks for 7-27 WEAT Meeting

4. Review of Jay Jaeger's work regarding a "scaffolding technical reference model" and current enterprise standards — Jay Jaeger, Michelle Eldridge

- 4.1. Review Jay Jaeger's Technical Reference Model
- 4.2. Review, discuss and rank current enterprise standards using a criteria of "current/valid", "sunset/retire" and "update".
- 4.3. Identify what standards need to be developed to support a "scaffolding technical reference model".
- 4.4. Define Next Steps
- 4.5. Assign Deliverables, Tasks for 7-27 WEAT Meeting

5. Presentation of the Working Council for Chief Information Officers Balanced Score Card for IT— Patricia Carlson

6. Discussion of how Balanced Scorecard Methodology would be applied to Technology Selection and Technology Investment decisions and scoring —All

- 6.1. Define Next Steps
- 6.2. Assign Deliverables, Tasks for 7-27 WEAT Meeting

7. Forrester Research Project – Patricia Carlson

8. Review list of action items and assignments for next WEAT meeting —Patricia Carlson

Action Items

1. Provide WEAT with a revised charter for review and comment. This charter will clarify the role of WEAT. – 7-19-2004 – Patricia
2. Provide WEAT with a Microsoft Project plan for short-term tactical deliverables and a written overview of longer-term deliverables for WEAT. – 7-20-2004 – Patricia
3. Draft Meeting Minutes and provide to WEAT – 7-16-2004 – Molly
4. Provide WEAT a spreadsheet with the list of principles, WEAT members will be asked to identify which principles should be in a balanced IT scorecard, a technology selection scorecard and which are best practices. – 7-19-2004 – Patricia
5. Compile list of volunteers to work on revising the Technical Reference Model framework. Jay will email to WEAT other Technical Reference Models to include in initial "components of a Technical Reference Model" spreadsheet. – 7-23-2004 – Patricia
6. Provide WEAT a copy of the portal tool RFB and Portal Governance Team Notes – 7-16-2004 – Patricia
7. Look for additional procurement activities and forward information to WEAT. – Ongoing – Patricia
8. Write proposed initial process for WEAT to provide architecture consulting services to the extended enterprise. – 7-23-2004 – Patricia

9. Update the WEAT Web site with today's meeting documents. – 7-23-2004 – Chrystal
10. Initiate a discussion with the UW e-Business consortia to investigate the use of a student project team to design & develop a web survey for what systems are in place within counties. Note this will be a joint effort with the Application Domain. – 7-23-2004 – Patricia
11. Coordinate a briefing for WEAT regarding the Crowe Chizek Server Consolidation Appraisal Phase deliverable. – 7-23-2004 – Patricia
12. Coordinate a briefing for WEAT with Marcia Doll (AIM-IT). – 7-23-2004 – Patricia
13. All WEAT members are to review the enterprise standards in preparation for the next WEAT meeting. – 7-26-2004 – All WEAT Members
14. WEAT will develop as part of its deliverables for "reference models" an architecture for "interface" or "integration" reference model. *Note this will require additional discussion, clarification within WEAT and will need to be a joint initiative with the Domains.*

Meeting Notes

1. Enterprise Updates

1.1. DET WEAT Staffing Changes

Ben Banks, Chris Alberts and Dan Proud were all needed to work on the BadgerNet procurement, as a result Patricia Carlson was named the Chief Enterprise Architect. To ensure WEAT is aligned with activities within the domains, Michelle Eldridge will be participating in the WEAT meetings. In addition Phil Schwarz and a TBD staff member from DET's Development and Operations Bureau will be participating in WEAT meetings to align data center operations and enterprise standards / strategy.

1.2. Email Consolidation

Patricia provided WEAT with context surrounding Matt's request for WEAT to recommend an operating system for Oracle Collaboration server. In general, Matt tends to request input / recommendations from multiple sources in order to make a well-informed decision and view issues from multiple perspectives.

Matt liked the format of the recommendation, the speed of the response and how the process functions. Other attendees commented that WEAT should be aware of Matt's "style" when developing processes to support the needs of the Chief Information Officer (CIO). In addition there was some discussion that Matt and DET's senior leadership are engaged around articulating Matt's vision for information technology within the enterprise.

1.3. Server Consolidation

The appraisal phase deliverable due has been extended to Friday July 23rd. Patricia will follow-up with Dane Perry the Server Consolidation Project Manager to schedule a briefing for WEAT with respect to the "as is" environment and the "to be" environment recommendations contained within the appraisal document. Information regarding the server consolidation project can be found at <http://serverconsolidation.wi.gov/>

1.4. AIM-IT

WEAT was provided with a copy of the AIM-IT Frequently Asked Questions document. AIM-IT is an enterprise asset management system that DET is developing for the enterprise. The first phase of AIM will be completed in October 2004. The first phase is to address immediate needs of the Server Consolidation project. DET senior leadership has recognized that an enterprise view of IT assets is essential to the work and relevance of WEAT work products. Prior to beginning phase two, AIM-IT staff will work closely with WEAT to ensure the system meets the business requirements associated

with an enterprise architecture effort. Patricia will coordinate a briefing for WEAT with Marcia Doll (AIM-IT project manager) and obtain relevant technical documentation for WEAT members (i.e. Rational Rose models and data dictionary).

1.5. BLC Update

1.5.1. Working Council of Chief Information Officers Competency Diagnostic Scorecard

WEAT members were provided with a copy of the Working Council of Chief Information Officer's Competency Diagnostic Scorecard for the key attributes for a "world-class" IT organization. Matt has asked (or will be asking) members of the TLC, BLC DET senior leadership and DET leadership to complete the diagnostic from the perspective of how DET is supporting enterprise IT needs. Matt is fully anticipating that DET will rank low in its ability to provide enterprise services and that all attributes will be considered important. Matt will be using this input to help guide DET in developing clear goals for its operations. It is anticipated that clearly defining goals that are linked to an organization's strategy and vision will enable an organization to improve in its delivery of services.

WEAT was provided with a copy of a "strategy framework" diagram. This diagram illustrates how an organization could measure "intangible" assets and provide a means to measure "outcomes" versus "outputs".

1.5.2. BLC Focus Groups and Common Business Needs

As part of the work in developing the State's enterprise IT plan, Michelle and DET governance staff initiated a series of focus groups around common business themes expressed either in agency IT plans or through a BLC planning session. An overview of the output of the focus groups was provided to WEAT. This is also available at:

<http://enterprise.state.wi.us/home/BLC/strategicplan/focusgroups.htm>. A listing of agency IT plans can be found at: <http://enterprise.state.wi.us/home/ITplans/2004/home.htm>

Jay noted that content management (which may be listed as "document management" or "imaging" in the document) is a very problematic area for the enterprise and that time should be dedicated to understanding what are the inter-relationships between various technologies and product sets in this particular market space. Jay expressed concerns with regards to the selection of Oracle Collaboration Server as the enterprise email platform as this may indeed complicate technology and product decisions with respect to content and document management.

All members of WEAT are to review these documents and offer suggestions where there are areas of overlap (i.e. Jay's comments above) or the potential for synergy between technologies that address common business issues.

1.5.3. Portal Governance Group

A portal governance group has been reconstituted under the BLC. Doug Bingenheimer is leading this group. Members of the group are Larry Studesville (DWD), Sue Reinardy (DHFS), Jamie Wall (Commerce) and Sally Drew (DPI).

Short term deliverables from the portal governance group include the identification of three to five applications to be deployed on Wisconsin.gov in a January 2005 timeframe and a recommendation for a charge-back model to support Wisconsin.gov enterprise portal development activities.

In order to support the deployment of the identified applications, DET will be releasing two RFP's. The first RFP will be for a portal and content management tool set. This RFP is being developed in conjunction with the portal governance group. A copy of the RFP will be provided to WEAT for comment. A second RFP will be issued by DET for "professional services" to develop the identified three to five applications.

It is anticipated that the identified applications will promote reuse and will unify common lines of business across different agencies or units of government as depicted in a illustration of how DET is viewing the portal tool set integrating with existing systems.

A concern was raised that the illustration did not provide a solution for back-end system integration. And as a result the State could end up with a 'hodge-podge' of technologies used to address back-end integration needs.

Jay stated that a better approach would be to develop a generalized integration or interface reference architecture. An interface architecture would clearly state how systems would be "accessed" or "integrated", basically this would state how we will design applications to ensure integration.

There was some discussion that the Enterprise Services Bus (ESB) will be used to provide information sharing. It was noted that we are not certain what the transactional capabilities are for the ESB, nor are we do we know if the ESB will integrate with the requirements from the portal for transaction-based applications.

2. Discussion regarding revised EA Deliverables and Work Products

Matt's vision for WEAT, is for it to act as an architecture and technical review board. Currently, there is a gap in how technical architecture decisions are made at the enterprise level. Matt views WEAT role to fill this gap. Matt would like WEAT to offer in a timely manner an "enterprise" or global perspective with regards to technical architecture and offer specific recommendations.

This vision makes several members of WEAT expressed concerns, as WEAT members may not have subject matter expertise in all potential technical subject areas. One way to address these concerns is to engage subject matter experts from the domains to provide WEAT with detailed technical advice, insight and recommendations. Questions were raised as to how WEAT would interact with the domains, would WEAT gather input from the domains or would the domains offer their own recommendations to Matt. These questions were not answered, but tabled for further discussion.

There was considerable discussion as to where and how WEAT should engage in enterprise architecture recommendations with respect to RFP's, Master Lease Financing Requests, Budget Appropriation Requests and other related activities. There was general consensus, that if WEAT provides input at the RFP stage, this would be too late to have any relevance or impact.

Specifically, WEAT would need to function in a strategic consulting role for the enterprise to have an impact. Other members did not agree with this approach, as there were valid concerns that WEAT would be "swamped" with requests. There were suggestions that WEAT should focus upon scorecards rather than developing new processes. Another proposal was to consider Matt as the primary customer of WEAT and that WEAT should focus upon addressing / responding to Matt's requests for the short term. It was also suggested that WEAT should focus upon contributing to the enterprise IT plan as WEAT could provide considerable input into the strategic architectural direction for the state in this vehicle.

Using all the input, comments and discussion points Patricia will draft and provide WEAT with a Microsoft Project plan for short-term tactical deliverables and a written overview of longer-term deliverables for WEAT. These documents will be discussed at the next WEAT meeting. It will be important to ensure that these documents provide clear scope definition, role identification and are consistent with the WEAT enterprise architecture principle document.

3. Discussion of Comments to EA Strategy and EA Business Plan Draft Document

Only three responses were received from the Agencies. A common theme among all three responses was "What is the role of WEAT?". Patricia will re-draft the WEAT charter and given the vision Matt has articulated for WEAT.

DET also submitted the EA documents to Meta Group, Gartner Group and Forrester for comments. Meta Group commented that many of the principles are really "best practices" and not "principles". Gartner stated that there were some inconsistencies between the principles. Members of WEAT expressed that they felt many of the principles aligned well with an IT Balanced Scorecard.

It was agreed that WEAT would not re-visit the principle document. Patricia will provide WEAT members with a spreadsheet containing a list of principles. WEAT members will be asked to identify which principles should be in a balanced IT scorecard, a technology selection scorecard and which are best practices. The results of this exercise will be discussed at the next WEAT meeting.

3.2. Vendor Comments

CGI-AMS provided WEAT with comments regarding the US Federal Government enterprise architecture initiatives. The resulting lessons learned from this experience are highly applicable to the WEAT initiative, particularly in the areas of the Federal Enterprise Architecture Reference Models, IT investment management, and government centers of excellence. As part of CGI-AMS' comments, they provided recommendations based on the Federal EA domain that are directly applicable to Wisconsin's approach.

4. Review of Jay Jaeger's work regarding a "scaffolding Technical Reference Model.

Jay began work on a scaffolding technical reference model (TRM). Jay reviewed TRM's produced by various organizations to try and determine what should be included in a TRM. Specifically Jay reviewed Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA), State of Massachusetts and US Federal Department of Health and Human Services. The format of the document is as follows: The first column identifies general groupings or categories. These were identified and influenced by the TRM's in the order we looked at them, and will need to be revisited; for example, a good comment was made that "Middleware" should be a higher-level category than it is. The second column identifies particular technologies around which standards had been adopted in the various TRM's. The remaining columns identify particular technologies adopted as standards in the various TRM's, followed (starting with the column containing "FEA") the TRM's which referred to those specific technologies. Follow ups would include identifying which domain is to have responsibility for each technology, listing the existing standards, and identifying targets for convergence.

Jay requested assistance in completing the first two columns, specifically the review of additional TRM's before we progress to identifying appropriate domains. As Jay will be on vacation, he requested assistance in his absence to complete the first two columns. Patricia will compile list of volunteers to work on revising the Technical Reference Model framework. Jay will email to WEAT other Technical Reference Models to include in initial "components of a Technical Reference Model" spreadsheet.

Michelle provided WEAT with a listing of enterprise standards, note some new standards have been issued in the Security and Information Privacy Domain and are not listed on the document. WEAT will need to review, discuss and rank current enterprise standards using a criteria of “current/valid”, “sunset/retire”, “update” and “create”. This work will then be integrated with the TRM. All WEAT members are to review the enterprise standards in preparation for the next WEAT meeting.

Next meeting is Tuesday, July 27, 8:30 to 12:30 in room (6F).